

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS  
EL PASO DIVISION**

---

Manuel Rodriguez,

Plaintiff,

v.

Professional Bureau of Collections of  
Maryland, Inc.,

Defendant.

---

:  
:  
: Civil Action No.: 3:18-cv-390  
:  
:  
:  
:  
:  
:  
:  
:  
:  
:

**COMPLAINT**

For this Complaint, Plaintiff, Manuel Rodriguez, by undersigned counsel, states as follows:

**JURISDICTION**

1. This action arises out of Defendant's repeated violations of the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act, 15 U.S.C. § 1692, *et seq.* (the "FDCPA").
2. Supplemental jurisdiction exists pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1367.
3. Venue is proper in this District pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b), in that Defendant transacts business in this District and a substantial portion of the acts giving rise to this action occurred in this District.

**PARTIES**

4. Plaintiff, Manuel Rodriguez ("Plaintiff"), is an adult individual residing in El Paso, Texas, and is a "consumer" as the term is defined by 15 U.S.C. § 1692a(3).
5. Defendant, Professional Bureau of Collections of Maryland, Inc. ("Professional"), is a Colorado business entity with an address of 5295 DTC Parkway, Greenwood Village, Colorado 80111, operating as a collection agency, and is a "debt collector" as the term is defined by 15 U.S.C. § 1692a(6).

**ALLEGATIONS APPLICABLE TO ALL COUNTS**

**A. The Debt**

6. Plaintiff allegedly incurred a financial obligation (the “Debt”) to an original creditor (the “Creditor”).

7. The Debt arose from services provided by the Creditor which were primarily for family, personal or household purposes, which meets the definition of a “debt” under 15 U.S.C. § 1692a(5).

8. The Debt was purchased, assigned or transferred to Professional for collection, or Professional was employed by the Creditor to collect the Debt.

9. Defendant attempted to collect the Debt and, as such, engaged in “communications” as defined in 15 U.S.C. § 1692a(2).

**B. Professional Engages in Harassment and Abusive Tactics**

10. Within the last year, Professional contacted Plaintiff in an attempt to collect the Debt.

11. On or about July 30, 2018, Plaintiff faxed a dispute letter to Professional which included a police report verifying that Plaintiff never lived at the address Professional was alleging Plaintiff was residing at.

12. Professional failed to address Plaintiff’s dispute letter and thereafter continued to call Plaintiff in an attempt to collect the Debt.

**C. Plaintiff Suffered Actual Damages**

13. Plaintiff has suffered and continues to suffer actual damages as a result of Defendant’s unlawful conduct.

14. As a direct consequence of Defendant's acts, practices and conduct, Plaintiff suffered and continues to suffer from humiliation, anger, anxiety, emotional distress, fear, frustration and embarrassment.

**COUNT I**  
**VIOLATIONS OF THE FDCPA 15 U.S.C. § 1692, et seq.**

15. Plaintiff incorporates by reference all of the above paragraphs of this Complaint as though fully stated herein.

16. Defendant's conduct violated 15 U.S.C. § 1692d in that Defendant engaged in behavior the natural consequence of which was to harass, oppress, or abuse Plaintiff in connection with the collection of a debt.

17. Defendant's conduct violated 15 U.S.C. § 1692d(5) in that Defendant caused a phone to ring repeatedly and engaged Plaintiff in telephone conversations, with the intent to annoy and harass.

18. Defendant's conduct violated 15 U.S.C. § 1692e in that Defendant used false, deceptive, or misleading representation or means in connection with the collection of a debt.

19. Defendant's conduct violated 15 U.S.C. § 1692e(10) in that Defendant employed false and deceptive means to collect a debt.

20. Defendant's conduct violated 15 U.S.C. § 1692f in that Defendant used unfair and unconscionable means to collect a debt.

21. Defendant's conduct violated 15 U.S.C. § 1692g(b) in that Defendant continued collection efforts even though the Debt had not been verified.

22. The foregoing acts and omissions of Defendant constitute numerous and multiple violations of the FDCPA, including every one of the above-cited provisions.

23. Plaintiff is entitled to damages as a result of Defendant's violations.

**COUNT II**  
**VIOLATIONS OF THE TEXAS DEBT COLLECTION ACT**  
**TEX. FIN. CODE ANN. § 392, et al.**

24. Plaintiff incorporates by reference all of the above paragraphs of this Complaint as though fully stated herein.

25. Plaintiff is a “consumer” as defined by Tex. Fin. Code Ann. § 392.001(1).

26. Defendant is a “debt collector” and a “third party debt collector” as defined by Tex. Fin. Code Ann. § 392.001(6) and (7).

27. Defendant caused a telephone to ring repeatedly, with the intent to annoy or abuse Plaintiff, in violation of Tex. Fin. Code Ann. § 392.302(4).

28. Plaintiff is entitled to injunctive relief and actual damages pursuant to Tex. Fin. Code Ann. § 392.403(a)(1) and (2) and to remedies under Tex. Bus. & Comm. Code § 17.62 pursuant to Tex. Fin. Code Ann. § 392.404(a).

**PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

**WHEREFORE**, Plaintiff prays that judgment be entered against Defendant:

1. Actual damages pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1692k(a)(1);
2. Statutory damages of \$1,000.00 pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1692k(a)(2)(A);
3. Costs of litigation and reasonable attorney’s fees pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1692k(a)(3);
4. Injunctive relief pursuant to Tex. Fin. Code Ann. § 392.403(a)(1);
5. Actual damages pursuant to Tex. Fin. Code Ann. § 392.403(a)(2);
6. Remedies under Tex. Bus. & Comm. Code § 17.62 pursuant to Tex. Fin. Code Ann. § 392.404(a);
7. Punitive damages; and
8. Such other and further relief as may be just and proper.

**TRIAL BY JURY DEMANDED ON ALL COUNTS**

Dated: December 20, 2018

Respectfully submitted,

By: /s/ Sergei Lemberg

Sergei Lemberg, *Attorney-in-Charge*  
Connecticut Bar No. 425027  
LEMBERG LAW, L.L.C.  
43 Danbury Road, 3<sup>rd</sup> Floor  
Wilton, CT 06897  
Telephone: (203) 653-2250  
Facsimile: (203) 653-3424  
E-mail: [slemberg@lemborglaw.com](mailto:slemberg@lemborglaw.com)  
Attorneys for Plaintiff